## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-19 remain in the application. Of these, claims 1-4 stand withdrawn, and claims 5-19 stand rejected.

## 1. Confirmation of Election

In response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement, applicants confirm their election of claims 5-19 (Group II) for examination.

# 2. Objections to the Specification

The Title is objected to as being non-descriptive. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that:

...Data pads in sync with a strobe pad, multiplexed to generate single data stream and two data streams and counter to count received strobe edges [are] aspects of the invention [that] should be mentioned in the title so that the title is more descriptive.

2/2/2006 Office Action, p. 5, sec. 4.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, the title has been amended to incorporate more of the limitations of applicants' claim 5. This amendment is not believed to add new matter.

Applicants' paragraph [0001] stands objected to in that the Examiner would like applicants to update the status of the patent application referenced therein. In response, applicants have updated the status of the referenced patent application. This update does not introduce new matter.

### 3. Request for Information

The Examiner requests information on any reference(s) known to qualify as prior art under 35 USC 102 or 103 (including any products for sale). The Examiner indicates that, in responding to this request, it is not required that applicant perform a search. Rather.

The request may be fulfilled by asking the attorney(s) of record handling prosecution and the inventor(s)/assignee for references qualifying as prior art. A simple statement that the query has been made and no prior art found is sufficient to fulfill the request.

2/2/2006 Office Action, p. 4, sec. 3.

The undersigned, as the attorney who prepared and filed this case, has discussed the Examiner's request for information with the inventors, as well as the inhouse attorney of the assignee who is responsible for overseeing this case. Neither the undersigned, nor any of the other parties mentioned in the preceding sentence, are aware of any additional reference(s) or acts (public uses or offers for sale) known to qualify as prior art.

#### 4. Request for Indications of Support for Claims

The Examiner requests that support be shown for any new or amended language in Applicants' claims. In response, Applicants have attached a Claims Appendix which provides a listing of Applicants' claims, as well as parenthetical indications of where support for the claims is found in Applicants' specification and drawings. Note that, in addition to the support locations noted, some claim elements may be mentioned in other (and numerous) locations within the specification and drawings.

# 5. Objection to Drawings

The drawings stand objected to. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that:

...The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the data pads in sync with a strobe pad, multiplexed to generate single data stream and two data streams and counter to count received strobe edges wherein particular counts of strobe edges received at a particular strobe pad cause data to be received by particular ones of the P storage elements associated with data pads corresponding to the particular strobe pad must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).

2/2/2006 Office Action, p. 6, sec. 5.

Applicants note that the Examiner has substantially paraphrased their claim 5. Support for claim 5, including support in the drawings, is indicated in the attached Claims Appendix (and see, especially, FIGS. 18 & 19). As a result, applicants submit that the Examiner's objection to the drawings is unsupported and should be withdrawn.

# 6. Double-Patenting Rejection

Claims 5-19 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent 6,633,965. To overcome this rejection, applicants have filed herewith a Terminal Disclaimer.

Appl. No. 10/685,940 Amendment dated May 2, 2006 Reply to Office Action dated Feb. 2, 2006

# 7. Conclusion

In light of the above Remarks, applicants request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted, DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

By:

Gregory W. Osterloth Reg. No. 36,232

Tel: (303) 291-3204